



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,622	05/31/2001	Scott J. Broussard	AUS920010260US1	1783

35617 7590 03/31/2008  
DAFFER MCDANIEL LLP  
P.O. BOX 684908  
AUSTIN, TX 78768

EXAMINER
----------

BONSHOCK, DENNIS G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2173

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/31/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* SCOTT J. BROUSSARD

---

Appeal 2008-0098  
Application 09/870,622  
Technology Center 2100

---

Decided: March 31, 2008

---

Before JAMES D. THOMAS, JOSEPH L. DIXON, and  
LANCE LEONARD BARRY, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

DIXON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from the Examiner's final rejection of claims 1-17. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We REVERSE.

## BACKGROUND

Appellant's invention relates to a system and method for encapsulating software components in an application program interface using a proxy object. (Spec. 1). More specifically, the presently invention overcomes the difficulties traditionally involved in migrating legacy applications from AWT to Swing by providing a functional extension of Swing - referred to herein as "AWTSwing" - which allows Swing components to be substituted for existing AWT components. The substitution of components enables the original AWT object to be redrawn or otherwise graphically displayed in a manner, which is independent from the operating system. (Specification - page 24, line 15 to line 29). (Br. 3). An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 1, which is reproduced below.

1. A system for graphical display of an object created by an application program running under an operating system, comprising:

a graphics resource component adapted to display the object independently of the operating system;

a proxy component, which associates the object with the graphics resource component and invokes methods of the graphics resource component to display the object; and

a peer component, adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and route the events to the proxy component.

### PRIOR ART

The prior art references of record relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the appealed claims are:

The Swing Connection, 2/98, Sun Microsystems, Volume 3, No.4, Swing Version 1.0 Introducing Swing, pages 1-7, (IS-SUN)

Mixing Heavy and Light Components, pages 1-13, (M-SUN)

### REJECTIONS

Claims 1-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over IS-SUN and M-SUN.

Rather than reiterate the conflicting viewpoints advanced by the Examiner and Appellant's regarding the above-noted rejection, we make reference to the Examiner's Answer (mailed January 29, 2007) for the reasoning in support of the rejections, and to Appellant's Brief (filed November 7, 2006) for the arguments thereagainst.

### OPINION

In reaching our decision in this appeal, we have given careful consideration to Appellant's Specification and claims, to the applied prior art references, and to the respective positions articulated by Appellant and the Examiner. As a consequence of our review, we make the determinations that follow.

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, it is incumbent upon the Examiner to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 1073 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In so doing, the Examiner must make the factual determinations set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966). “[T]he Examiner bears the initial burden, on review of the prior art or on any other ground, of presenting a *prima facie* case of unpatentability.” *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Furthermore, “‘there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness’ . . . [H]owever, the analysis need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007)(quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)).

In the combination of IS-SUN and M-SUN, we find no teachings of peer and proxies being used in combination as set forth in the language of independent claim 1. Furthermore, even if the combination of M-SUN and IS-SUN would have been proper, we do not find that the combination of M-SUN and IS-SUN teaches or fairly suggests the invention as recited in independent claim 1.

From our review of the Examiner's rejection, we find the Examiner's rejection to be based on unreasonable claim terminology interpretation as similar terminology is used in the references. Moreover, we do not find

clear support for the Examiner's conclusions from the express teachings of M-SUN and IS-SUN. Additionally, we find that the teachings of M-SUN clearly suggestive not using the combination of teachings as asserted by the Examiner.

Appellant argues that:

The presently claimed case provides a solution to the above-mentioned problem by creating a proxy component, which is not included within the existing classes of software components currently belonging to the Swing application program interface (API). The presently claimed proxy component enables Swing components to be successfully incorporated within AWT-based application programs by associating existing heavyweight (AWT) objects with lightweight (Swing) graphics resource components. This enables the proxy component to invoke the methods of the lightweight graphics resource components for displaying the objects independently from the operating system. The presently claimed peer component differs from typical Swing peer components by routing events intended for the existing heavyweight object to the presently claimed proxy component. See, Specification, page 24, line 8 - page 29, line 10.

(Br. 8). We agree with Appellant.

Appellant further argues that

However, a "Swing class" cannot be considered equivalent to a "proxy component" as suggested by the Examiner, since a "Swing class" merely defines the properties and methods (e.g., shape, color, size, location on screen, behavior, etc.) of a collection of Swing objects, whereas a "proxy component" actually functions to associate an object (e.g., a button displayed in a GUI) with a graphics resource component (e.g., JButton 48) and to invoke the methods of the graphics resource component (e.g., run the program code contained within JButton 48) for displaying the object. A "Swing class," in

itself, does not and cannot function to associate an object with a graphics resource component, invoke the methods of the graphics resource component, or display the object. Therefore, the mere mention of Swing classes within M-SUN does not provide teaching or suggestion for the proxy component recited in present claims 1, 9, and 17.

(Br. 9). We agree with Appellant.

Appellant further argues that:

Furthermore, though a "peer component" may be an "ancestor" of some other object, merely stating so provides no evidence of the peer component being adapted to receive events pertaining to the object and to route the events to a proxy component. Since M-SUN fails to provide teaching for a "proxy component", any peer components that may be described by M-SUN cannot be configured to route events to a non-existent proxy component. As such, M-SUN also fails to provide teaching or suggestion for the peer component recited in present claims 1, 9, and 17.

(Br. 10). We agree with Appellant.

Appellant argues that the Examiner's interpretation of the term "proxy" to mean merely a "substitute" to be unreasonable and does not address the merits of the claim limitations in the context as recited in independent claim 1. (Br. 10-11). We agree with Appellant and find that the Examiner is dissecting the claim limitations rather than evaluating the claim as a whole.

Since we find that the Examiner has not shown that the combination of M-SUN and IS-SUN would have taught or fairly suggested the invention as recited in independent claim 1, we cannot sustain the rejection of

independent claim 1 and its respective dependent claims. We find similar limitation in independent claims 9 and 17, and we cannot sustain the rejection of independent claims 9 and 17 and their respective dependent claims.

Moreover, with respect to dependent claims 7, 8, 15, and 16, Appellant argues that none of the cited prior art teaches or suggests that, when the object is part of a layout, the association of the object with the graphics resource component can be used to establish a parent-child relationship between the layout and the graphics resource component, which allows the graphics resource component to draw a (lightweight) object over an existing image of the (heavyweight) object originally drawn with the aid of the windowing system of the operating system. (Br. 13). We agree with Appellant and find that the Examiner seems to have viewed the claimed relationships in the reverse order than is specifically recited in the language of the dependent claims. Therefore, we cannot sustain the rejection of dependent claims 7, 8, 15, and 16 for this additional reason.

## CONCLUSION

To summarize, we have reversed the rejection of claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

REVERSED



Appeal 2008-0098  
Application 09/870,622

pgc

DAFFER MCDANIEL LLP  
P.O. BOX 684908  
AUSTIN, TX 78768